

closer examination of Deakin indicates that Deakin teaches depositing a layer of platinum on a titanium alloy substrate and the layer of aluminum over the layer of platinum (page 3, lines 5-10; page 5, lines 11-30), and not particles of either platinum or aluminum in a carrier.

Thus, it is clear that Deakin fails to teach applying a coating comprising particulate platinum and particulate aluminum in an organic carrier, as recited in independent claim 1. Moreover, Deakin does not teach an organic carrier that includes particulate platinum and particulate aluminum, and as such cannot achieve a platinum aluminide diffusion barrier on a titanium alloy by a straight-forward application method and at a temperature in the range 200°C to 600°C, as recited in independent claim 1.

Furthermore, a closer examination of Deakin also indicates that Deakin teaches that the reaction treatment is performed for a period of two hours at a temperature of 750°C (page 6, lines 6-12). Accordingly, Deakin also does not disclose or suggest heating the platinum and aluminum particles to a temperature in the range of about 200°C to about 600°C, as recited in independent claim 1. By performing a reaction treatment at a temperature as high as 750°C, Deakin cannot obtain a coating that is less likely to be distorted during the cooling process, as indicated in the specification at, for example, page 12, lines 9-11, or such that the uncoated regions of the substrate are oxidized to a lesser degree and thus the integrity of the alloy in reducing the formation of an oxide is retained. Accordingly, it is clear that the advantages obtained by the method claimed in independent claim 1 are not exhibited by Deakin, and as such, the method claimed in independent claim 1 cannot be obvious over Deakin.

Sangeeta teaches a method for preparing an aluminum alloy containing a coating composition (Abstract). Moreover, Sangeeta teaches particulate platinum and aluminum slurries that are treated at a temperature of about 800°C to 1,200°C (col. 7, lines 25-30).

Thus, Sangeeta fails to cure deficiencies in Deakin in disclosing or rendering obvious the futures of independent claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, not only does a combination of Sangeeta and Deakin fail to disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1, but such a combination also fails to render obvious the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1, and its dependent claims, are patentable over a combination of Deakin and Sangeeta.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7 and 15-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Tarik M. Nabi  
Registration No. 55,478

JAO:TMN/amw

Date: August 9, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--